



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,891	10/08/2004	Mika P. Mustonen	879A.0031.U1(US)	8568
29683	7590	06/04/2009	EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC			ROBINSON, GRETA LEE	
4 RESEARCH DRIVE, Suite 202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			2169	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/510,891	Applicant(s) MUSTONEN ET AL.
	Examiner Greta L. Robinson	Art Unit 2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,9,12-14,16 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,9,12-14,16 and 20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 November 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 9, 2009 has been entered.

2. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 12-14, 16 and 20 are currently pending. Claims 1, 6, 14 and 20 have been amended. Claims 2, 7, 10, 11, 15, and 17-19 have status cancelled.

Drawings

3. Figure 2a should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. Support for this feature can be found in the disclosure on page 4 at lines 21-24. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES

Replacement Drawing Sheets

Drawing changes must be made by presenting replacement sheets which incorporate the desired changes and which comply with 37 CFR 1.84. An explanation of the changes made must be presented either in the drawing amendments section, or remarks, section of the amendment paper. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). A replacement sheet must include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing(s) must not be labeled as "amended." If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not accepted by the examiner, applicant will be notified of any required corrective action in the next Office action. No further drawing submission will be required, unless applicant is notified.

Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and within the top margin.

Annotated Drawing Sheets

A marked-up copy of any amended drawing figure, including annotations indicating the changes made, may be submitted or required by the examiner. The annotated drawing sheet(s) must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Sheet" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings.

Timing of Corrections

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings MUST be filed within the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability." Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 12-14, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The disclosure does not appear to describe claimed feature modifying both the address field and virtual function keys based on input of the user alphanumeric, only the address field appears to be modified based on alphanumeric input of the user [note page 7 lines 5-17, example four illustrates "search mode" alters the network browser's function keys]. See page 6 line 15 through page 7 line 33. However, the disclosure appears to teach function keys change based on a function description mode or application used see page 6 lines 6-14. The claims appear to omit reference to a particular mode (i.e. function description modes) see Figure 2b element 21 function description modes.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 12-14, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: The claims appear to omit reference to a particular mode (i.e. function description modes) see Figure 2b element 21. The disclosure appears to teach function keys change based on a mode or application used see page 6 lines 6-14. Figure 2b element 21 function description modes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 12-14, 16 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boroumand et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156870 A1 in view of Henricksen *Adapting the Web Interface: an Adaptive Web Browser.*

Regarding claim 1, Boroumand et al. teaches a method comprising: displaying a network browser installed on an information processing device for searching, processing and presenting information, the network browser comprising at least an

address field and virtual function keys associated with it; receiving in the address field information relating to an address by direct user input [note: paragraph 0066 "receives the HTTP request from the user's web browser, at step 612. The request includes the URL that was constructed by the client software"]; determining in the information processing device if the information entered in the address input field is a valid server address [note: paragraph 0066-0067 "The central server then determines a load" (i.e. ensures that the servers are available or valid, note alternate schemes disclosed)]; and establishing a connection to a server if it is determined that the information entered in the address input field is a valid server address; and modifying the address field and virtual keys so as to be in accordance with a service used at the time [see: paragraphs 0007, 0014, 0022, paragraphs 0066 and 0069-0070], wherein the modification of the address field and virtual keys is based on alphanumeric data input of the user in the network browser address field [note: paragraph 0072-0074; and Figure 6]. Although Boroumand et al. teach the invention substantially as cited above, they do not explicitly teach that the modification of the address field and virtual keys is based on alphanumeric data input of the user. Henricksen et al. teaches an adaptive web browser in which adaptation of the web interface can be designed and implemented in many forms, such as by user input [see: page 21, abstract; section two Adaptation, "Classes of adaptation that can be employed by web browser include, but are not limited to those listed in table 1"; page 22 Table 1 Adaptation Classes; also note sections 2.2 and 2.3 "In order to support a range of device types with varying input output capabilities, as well as different modes of interaction depending on the user's capabilities, preferences and activities, it is necessary for the browser to be

Art Unit: 2169

capable of dynamically adapting its interface to the context"]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined Henricksen et al. with Boroumand et al. because Henricksen et al. teaches classes of adaptation may be employed by the web browser interface through design to support an increasing range of the web's ability. Henricksen et al. teaches the web must be able to adapt and support a changing network [page 23 section 3.1 HTTP Support for adaptation].

Regarding claim 3, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the information processing device is connected via a communications network [see: paragraph 0082].

Regarding claim 4, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the network browser at the information processing device is used to open a service provider's www page [note: paragraph 0035].

Regarding claim 5, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the input data fields on the www page are filled out by entering information in the service specific address field [note: paragraph 0014].

Regarding claim 6, Boroumand et al. teaches an address field with associated virtual function keys belonging to a network browser installed at an information processing device [note: paragraphs 0072-0074; Figure 6].

Regarding claim 8, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein said service used is one of the following: telephone service, calculator, payment, information search [note: paragraphs 0028-0030; Figure 1].

Regarding claim 9, Boroumand et al. teaches the virtual keys of the network browser are modified so as to make the use of the service easier [note: paragraph 0035].

Regarding claim 12, Boroumand et al. teaches a www page server connected to a communications network ... [note: paragraphs 0039-0043, 0072-0074 and Figure 6].

Regarding claim 13, Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the address field and virtual function keys associated with the www page are arranged to be modified ... [note; paragraph 0051].

Regarding claim 14, Boroumand et al. teaches a communications network terminal [see: paragraphs 0022, 0050, 0100, 0101, 0106, and 0072-0074; Figure 6].

Regarding claim 16, Boroumand et al. teaches which is a terminal of a cellular network [note; paragraph 0029-0030, 0038 and 0106].

The limitations of claims 20-22 have been addressed above except for the element of a mobile wireless terminal as the device for displaying browser application [note:

Boroumand et al. teaches wherein the plurality of services comprises telephone service paragraphs 0028-0030; Figure 1].

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the response filed February 26, 2009 Applicant argued the prior art, Henricksen, does not teach modification of the address field **based on alphanumeric data input of the user** in the network and does not suggest that a user input in the address field of a www browser could be useful somehow in providing a remedy for Boroumand. In response to Applicant's argument the examiner respectfully maintains the prior art rejection citing Henricksen et al. combined with Boroumand et al. supra. Note primary reference Boroumand et al. teaches determining if the information entered is valid through the central server's load function [see: paragraph 0066-0067 "The central server then determines a load" (i.e. ensures that the servers are available or valid, note alternate schemes disclosed)]. The process of determining whether information is valid suggest information is entered into the www browser. This procedure acts as a check to see if the servers are available. Boroumand states various schemes may be implemented as a process for determining how to direct data [see: paragraphs 0066-0071]. Also note Figure 3 (316) maps URLs to specific or virtual keys; Figure 5 (514) intercepts key press; Figure 5 (520) obtain web address; and Figure 6 (618) redirect request to another server. Although Boroumand et al. teaches alternate schemes at paragraph 0069; Henricksen et al. further discloses modification by input [see: page 21,

abstract; section two Adaptation, "Classes of adaptation that can be employed by web browser include, but are not limited to those listed in table 1"; page 22 Table 1 Adaptation Classes; also note sections 2.2 and 2.3 "In order to support a range of device types with varying input output capabilities, as well as different modes of interaction depending on the user's capabilities, preferences and activities, it is necessary for the browser to be capable of dynamically adapting its interface to the context"].

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., track a service used in the www browser and adapted the user interface for the service) are not recited in the claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Inoue et al. US Patent 6,510,153 B1

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta L. Robinson whose telephone number is (571)272-4118. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM.

Art Unit: 2169

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571)272-4078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Greta L. Robinson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169
June 03, 2009